

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haumont et al. (U.S. Publication US 2001/0012279 A1 "Haumont"). Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Farley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,032 "Farley"). Claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Farley as applied to claims 1-5, and in further view of Strawczynski et al. (U.S. Application No. 09/835,102 "Strawczynski"). Claims 8 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Padovani et al. (U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0142656 A1 "Padovani"). Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Padovani and further in view of Farley. Claims 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Padovani as applied to claims 8 and 11-12, and further in view of Kumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,572 "Kumar"). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haumont in view of Strawczynski.

Claims 1 and 18 are amended herein to more clearly address teachings of the present invention. In particular, these claims were amended to particularly point out the interaction between a central buffer and a plurality of distributed buffers.

Haumont, which serves as the primary reference for all rejections, discloses a first embodiment having distributed buffers in a plurality of base station. (see page 4, paragraph [0049]) Haumont further discloses a second embodiment having a central buffer located in a base station controller (see page 6, paragraph [0079]). Haumont fails to disclose a system having both a central buffer in the base station controller and distributed buffers in a plurality of base

stations serviced by the base station controller. Farley, Strawczynski, Padovani, and Kumar further fail to disclose a system having both a central buffer and a plurality of distributed buffers.

Each of pending independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 18 requires interaction between a central buffer and a plurality of distributed buffers. In particular, claim 1 recites, inter alia,
5 "downloading a next plurality of blocks of data of the group of blocks of data from a central buffer to the respective buffer of each base station of the active set of base stations". Claim 8, 13, and 18 require similar interaction between the central buffer and the plurality of distributed buffers. None of the cited references discloses interaction between a central buffer and a plurality of distributed buffers, as recited in claims 1, 8, 13, and 18. Thus, the cited references
10 fail to disclose all elements of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 18.

For these reasons, independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 18 are not obvious over the cited references. All other pending claims depend from one of claims 1, 8, 13, or 18 and are allowable for at least this reason. All claims are now allowable and a notice of allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney at the address
15 indicated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2005

By: /Bruce E. Garlick/
Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. 36,520

Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
(512) 264-8816
(512) 264-3735 fax